DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 879 EA 018 482

TITLE An Assessment of the Need for Funding to Provide Facilities for the Unhoused School Population Anticipated between 1986 and 1991. Report No. D86-1.
INSTITUTION California State Dept. of Finance, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 64p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Construction Costs; *Construction Needs; *Educational Facilities; Educational Facilities Improvement; Educational Facilities Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Trends; *Facility Requirements; Needs Assessment; Questionnaires; School Construction; School Expansion; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

New schools will have to be built and existing facilities rehabilitated to house California's growing enrollment. The state conducted a study to determine the need for funding to meet this new demand. Questionnaires were sent to each of the state's 1,029 school districts and 58 county offices of education. Offices responsible for over 85 percent of the projected 1990-91 enrollment responded. Half of the reporting districts indicated that they would need additional facilities. Postsurvey interviews with district officials led to both upward and downward revisions of reported estimates. The revised estimate for new construction was set at $2.8 billion. The survey also revealed a need for current facility rehabilitation costing up to $1.9 billion and a need for new facilities for special day classes valued at $228 million. The report briefly reviews enrollment pressures and the state role in funding, discusses the methodology of the survey, and analyzes the survey findings and adjustments to the findings. The report recommends that all parties involved in school construction efforts consider several factors during the planning process, including keeping some relocatable facilities, using standard designs, seeking local matching funds, and establishing standards for usable space. The survey questionnaire is appended. (PGD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bert H. Bresdle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 018 482

# AN ASSESSMENT OF THE NEED FOR FUNDING TO PROVIDE FACILITIES FOR THE UNHOUSED SCHOOL POPULATION ANTICIPATED BETWEEN 1986 AND 1991

PREPARED BY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
PROGRAM EVALUATION UNIT

JESSE R. HUFF
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

RICHARD RAY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,
LEGISLATION

RICHARD L. CUTTING
CHIEF, PROGRAM
EVALUATION UNIT

FEBRUARY 1986

# PREFACE

During the 1985 legislative session, several pieces of legislation were introduced to deal with the problem of a lack of school housing to meet the anticipated increase in enrollments. The estimates of construction and rehabilitation funding which would be needed varied greatly, ranging from a five year need of $10 Billion estimated by the Department of Education to a ten year estimate of need of $4.9 Billion developed by the Governor's Infrastructure Task Force.

As a result of the difference between the estimates of need, the Governor vetoed most, but not all of the legislation and requested his Education Advisor and the Department of Finance to conduct a survey of all K-12 school districts to ascertain as precisely as possible the need for new school facilities and for rehabilitating the current school housing stock. Responsibility for conducting the survey and assessing the need was assigned to the Program Evaluation Unit of the Department of Finance. This report presents the findings of our efforts.

We would like to acknowledge the input from representatives of the educational community, the Department of Education and the Governor's Office who helped us shape the questionnaire which was used

to solicit the information from the local level. We would also like to thank the staff of the local educational community and county offices of education who provided responses to the questionnaire and assisted us during our field visits and numerous telephone conversations to better understand the information they had provided.

We trust this report will provide a basis for meeting the educational community's need for housing their future anticipated enrollments.

PROJECT SUPERVISOR:

BERT H. BRENDLE
MANAGING PRINCIPAL

PROJECT STAFF
PROGRAM EVALUATION:

KERRY ADLFINGER
CORAZON DULAY
PATRICIA LAURENT
MOTI MALKANI
DENNIS MEHL
CHARLES PILLSBURY
ELEANOR REYNOLDS
WALTER SCHAFF

FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE
ACCOUNTABILITY:

SUE BOTKINS
HAROLD FJOSNE
RAMON JUAREZ
HONEY LUM

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| PREFACE | | iii |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | | vii |
| CHAPTER I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| CHAPTER II. | METHODOLOGY | 3 |
| CHAPTER III. | SURVEY RESULTS | 7 |
| CHAPTER IV. | ADJUSTMENTS FOR COMPARABILITY | 15 |
| CHAPTER V. | CONSIDERATIONS FOR A NEW SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAM | 21 |
| APPENDIX A. | SURVEY INSTRUMENT | 35 |
| APPENDIX B. | COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF TEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS | 53 |

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California presently is experiencing an expansion in K-12 enrollments which is placing a strain on the existing school housing stock. This expansion is expected to place continuing pressure on school facilities over the next several years.

During 1985, educators, the Legislature and the Governor deliberated ways to address this need. In response, estimates of the need were made by both the Department of Education and the Governor's Infrastructure Task Force and legislation was introduced to provide funding for school construction. However, because the two major estimates of need varied by so much, the Governor vetoed most key school construction legislation and directed his Education Advisor and the Department of Finance to determine the magnitude of funding need.

To identify the need, a questionnaire was developed jointly by the Governor's Office and the Department of Finance, with some input from the educational community. It was sent to each of the 1029 school districts and 58 county offices of education in the State. Amongst other things, districts and county offices of education were requested to report to the Department of Finance their estimates of projected enrollments for the following five years and to report their estimate of how much of the projected enrollment could not be housed within

existing facilities. The districts and county offices also were requested to report the extent of their need to rehabilitate existing facilities.

Seven-hundred-thirty-seven districts and county offices returned the survey. These responses represented over 85 percent of the projected 1990-91 enrollment. Some districts did not respond to the questionnaire because they had no anticipated need; others indicated they lacked the resources to complete the survey.

Statewide, the respondents expected their enrollments to increase from the 1985-86 level of 3,489,740 to 4,057,547 in 1990-91, an increase over a five year period of 16.3 percent (an average compounded increase of 3.1 percent per year). Based on local housing policies; e.g., classroom loading standards and setting aside classrooms for specialized instruction purposes such as computer laboratories, and excluding certain non-owned portable and other temporary facilities, the reporting districts indicated a total capacity of 3,943,748, nearly enough to house the anticipated enrollments in 1990-91. The space problem arises due to the location of this capacity ... often it is not where the districts anticipate the enrollment growth. Many districts report large amounts of excess space, while other districts have excess space in some parts of the district, but have a space shortage in another part of the district.

New Construction Need

Using local policies for housing students, about half of the reporting districts (354) reported that their current facilities would be inadequate to house the anticipated expansion of enrollments through

1990-91. Collectively, the districts anticipated that additional facilities to house 486,449 students (86 percent of the expected enrollment increase) would be needed by 1990-91. Applying the codified standards used by the Office of Local Assistance, 55, 75 and 85/87 square feet per student for elementary, junior high and high school, respectively, at an average cost of $100 per square foot, the amount of funding needed to provide housing for these 486,449 students would be $3.17 Billion over the next five years. The annual increment needed for this five year period is:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1986-87 | $948 Million |
| 1987-88 | $448 Million |
| 1988-89 | $521 Million |
| 1989-90 | $578 Million |
| 1990-91 | $672 Million |

As a result of our field visits and telephone contacts, we found some school officials had misunderstood the intent of the survey form and, thus, either under- or over-reported their facility needs. Other districts had excluded some available space from their inventories because the facilities were being used for other purposes or local officials wanted to house all of their students in permanent structures, rather than in portable or relocatable classrooms.

When these situations were discovered, they were discussed with the local officials and their reported need for facilities was adjusted if the local district agreed. This resulted in the initially reported need of just over $2.6 Billion being increased to the $3.17 Billion reported above.

There were cases where the local district did not agree to having their survey reports revised. They felt that their response should reflect local desires for the educational program. Since the basis for the school facility survey was to identify local needs for facilities based on current district policies, if the desired local policies were not consistent with the current district policies, these districts' reports were recalculated to reflect the prescribed instructions, resulting in a revised need for new construction of $2.8 Billion, with the following annual need:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1986-87 | $821 Million |
| 1987-88 | $381 Million |
| 1988-89 | $462 Million |
| 1989-90 | $537 Million |
| 1990-91 | $633 Million |

The above estimate excludes $228 Million for the additional space allocated to special day class enrollment due to its expected increase.

It is important to note that, while the schools have reported a need for space which would cost $2.8 Billion to construct, they would not actually be eligible for State funding for this amount under current State standards. Many districts based their projections of unhoused need upon assumptions which are inconsistent with the State's policies. For example, many districts calculated their "unhoused need" using class sizes which are significantly lower than the sizes which the State uses to determine eligibility. We estimate that the $2.8 Billion may be 10 to 15 percent higher than the amount that would actually be approved under the State's current standards for qualifying for State construction assistance.

x

Rehabilitation Need

School districts and county offices reported a need to rehabilitate classrooms based on the age of the facility and whether school officials thought the facilities were "worthy of rehabilitation". The estimated number of students that could be affected by this rehabilitation need is 1,138,139 students. If all of these facilities were to be rehabilitated, the cost could be as high as $1.9 Billion for the current and next five years. Annually, this could be:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1985-86 | $1,186 Million |
| 1986-87 | $ 197 Million |
| 1987-88 | $ 145 Million |
| 1988-89 | $ 151 Million |
| 1989-90 | $ 117 Million |
| 1990-91 | $ 112 Million |

In calculating the dollar value of this rehabilitation, we used the existing OLA standard that a rehabilitation project cannot exceed 25 percent of the cost of new construction. Therefore, we used $25 per square foot after applying the grade level square footage standards previously noted.

We believe the estimate of $1.9 Billion should be viewed with some reservations, since it represents the maximum needed outlay under the worst conditions. Reasons for this qualification include:

District facility utilization plans excluded only $103 million of the reported capacity as being unusable during the next five years because of a need for rehabilitation. In different terms, it seems that local schools could and would continue to house students in the capacity the districts have reported as eligible for rehabilitation.

The OLA standards of 25 percent of the cost of new construction is a maximum. Actual rehabilitations could cost far less than the $25 per square foot.

Because of limited time and resources and the judgmental nature of the term "worthy of rehabilitation," the study team did not attempt to validate the reported need for rehabilitating classroom facilities. In addition, unlike the secondary sources available for enrollment projections, alternate data was not available for cross-checking the reported rehabilitation data.

Other Factors

We conclude this report with a discussion of some factors that should be considered as a part of any program to provide funding for the construction of local schools. Included are factors such as a required percentage of relocatable facilities to avoid some unusable space in the future; use of standard building designs; a source for local match of construction funding; and standards on what is counted as usable space.

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

From 1972 to 1981, enrollments in California's public schools declined by 11 percent and many districts found themselves with excess classroom capacity. In some cases empty schools had to be maintained, converted to alternate uses or sold. Now the situation has reversed. With statewide enrollments rising rapidly, many districts and county offices are experiencing strains on their existing facilities.

In addition to growing enrollments in areas with new housing development, some districts are experiencing growth due to unexpected sociological changes such as the influx of immigrants into the Los Angeles area. Further compounding the space problem in some districts are facilities which have been diverted to other uses such as child care centers and unused classroom space that has been placed out on long term leases.

Unfortunately, the problem is more complicated than just the growth in enrollment. Statewide, there is nearly enough existing classroom capacity to house the anticipated increase in enrollments for the next five years; however, the capacity often is not where the growth is occurring. This disparity means that not only is the State faced with providing classroom space to house the increased enrollments, but also it must provide funds or alternative uses for the excess facilities.

During 1985, the educational community, the Legislature and the Governor discussed ways to deal with the school facility problem. The educational community brought their school facility concerns to the Legislature and the Governor. Studies were initiated to determine the extent of the need, and legislation was introduced to begin dealing with the problem.

When the time came to make the final decisions, the Governor found that there was little consensus on the magnitude of needed funding. An estimate provided by the Department of Education indicated a need for $10 Billion over the next five years, while an estimate provided by the Governor's Infrastructure Task Force indicated the need to be approximately $4.9 Billion over the next ten years. As a result of this difference, the Governor vetoed the proposed legislation and directed his Educational Advisor and the Director of Finance to conduct a comprehensive survey to determine the level of funding need. Responsibility for conducting the survey was assigned to the Program Evaluation Unit in the Department of Finance.

## CHAPTER II

## METHODOLOGY

Because of the importance of accurately determining the level of funding needed to meet the State's school facilities need, and because of the large difference between previous estimates of need, it seemed necessary to collect primary data from the local school districts and county offices of education. A comprehensive questionnaire was chosen as the primary data collection instrument since time and staffing did not permit a visit to all local educational entities.

Many sectors of government were interested in the outcome from the survey; hence, study staff sought input and support from these sectors in the development of the survey instrument. Included were representatives from the Governor's Office, the Department of Finance Budget Units, a lobbyist for the education community, a local school district representative and two representatives from the Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH).

Meetings were held with interested parties, resulting in a comprehensive survey instrument designed to collect data on multiple aspects of local operations and on local expectations for the next five years. Included in the survey topics were enrollment projections, district student housing capacity, teacher loading ratios, space used for pull-out programs, estimates of unhoused enrollments requiring new facilities, identification of rehabilitation needs, etc. When the survey form was completed, it was field tested and necessary adjustments

made before the survey was actually disseminated to the educational community. (See Appendix A for a copy of the survey instrument.)

Several steps were taken to assure a good response to the questionnaire. First, on September 10, 1985, a letter was sent to all school districts and county offices by the Governor's Advisor on Education. The purpose of this letter was to alert district and county superintendents that the survey was coming and to advise them of its purpose. On September 23, 1985, the Governor's Education Advisor transmitted the survey form to each district and county office.

On the 24th of September, a second letter by the Governor's Advisor on Education was sent to all county superintendents advising them of the availability of training sessions upon request. When the counties contacted us regarding training, we encouraged them to invite their school districts and districts from neighboring counties. During the first two weeks of October, project staff conducted training sessions for the 25 counties requesting training.

In addition to the above efforts, the Governor's Education Advisor took steps to assure a good response to the survey by encouraging a timely response to the survey in various speeches he gave around the State and in personal meetings with various district and county superintendents. Beyond this, during the course of the survey submittal period, both the Governor's Education Advisor, his staff and staff of the Program Evaluation Unit made calls to many of the non-reporting districts, especially those that were identified as expecting high enrollment growth. As a result of these efforts, 737 districts and county offices of education, nearly 70 percent of the

State's school districts and county offices and representing over 85 percent of the expected 1990-91 enrollment, responded to the survey.

Chapter III will aggregate selected data collected via the survey instrument and will report the district-reported need for new construction and rehabilitation of existing facilities.

As a final part of the methodology, we visited about 200 of the reporting districts in 21 different counties. Counties were selected using official Department of Finance demographic projections to include the counties with the largest and/or most rapidly growing school age population. The selection of districts to visit was based on survey responses, with a major focus on districts reporting unhoused enrollments. The purpose of the district visits were threefold:

To gain an understanding of how the district had interpreted the instructions and had completed the survey,

To obtain an understanding of how enrollment growth was affecting local operations and how the districts presently were housing their students; and

To be able to provide assurance to users of the survey data that the reported data validly reflected the situation at the local level.

Chapter IV will review the findings made from the field visits and will qualify some of the data reported in Chapter III.

# CHAPTER III

# SURVEY RESULTS

This and the following Chapter will present study findings from two perspectives. In this Chapter, we will present the data as submitted by the districts or as revised with the concurrence of the district. During our visits to some districts, situations were observed in which districts had not interpreted particular questions as was intended by the study design. This led to questioning the validity of some of the submitted data. In most cases the district agreed to revise its response after study staff explained the intent of the question. In a few cases, however, the district did not agree to make the changes. Chapter IV presents the data as it was modified to reflect consistent interpretation of the survey questions.

## Accuracy of Enrollment Projections

One basic question is how accurate the district projections of future enrollments would be projected out for five years. In an effort to test the accuracy of the district projections, districts and county offices were asked to submit their projections of enrollment by grade level to the fiscal year 1990-91. This data was aggregated by county and then compared to the official county enrollment projections prepared by the Population Research Unit of the Department of Finance.

Generally, we found that the countywide total of district enrollment projections compared favorably with the official county estimates of enrollment projected by the Population Research Unit. In the two instances where the enrollment projections varied significantly from Finance's projections, we requested the Population Research Unit to review the district projections and projection methodology. In both instances, the Population Research Unit did not take exception to the district methodology and projection since the districts were using more recent enrollment indices.

**Conclusion: District enrollment projections to the year 1990-91 appear to be consistent with the enrollment projections made by the Population Research Unit of the Department of Finance.**

District Estimate of Unhoused Enrollments

Less than half of the responding districts and county offices (354 of the 737 respondents) reported a projected unhoused enrollment during the five year period 1986-87 to 1990-91. Based on the district/county office assessment of unhoused enrollment for the period, a total of $3.17 Billion will be required to provide housing for these students.[1]

As originally submitted, the districts reported a need of only $2.6 Billion. This resulted because several districts submitted incomplete forms, misunderstood what was requested, used questionable projection methods, or did not exclude non-owned portable/relocatable facilities from capacity. These problems were corrected via the

---

[1]This estimate was derived by applying the codified standards used by the Office of Local Assistance to the estimated unhoused enrollment by grade level.

district visits and through telephone calls to districts with questionable data, resulting in the revised $3.17 billion need reported above.

The $3.17 Billion need on an annual basis is:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1986-87 | $948 Million |
| 1987-88 | $448 Million |
| 1988-89 | $521 Million |
| 1989-90 | $578 Million |
| 1990-91 | $672 Million |

In deriving its estimates of eligibility for State funding, the Office of Local Assistance (OLA) uses standards of 55 square feet for each K-6 grade enrollment, 75 square feet for each 7-8 grade enrollment and 85/87 square feet for each 9-12 grade enrollment. The average construction cost per square foot used for the cost estimate was $100 which OLA indicates is an average that includes land, permits, architectural fees, construction, equipment and other related costs.

**Finding: Based on existing OLA standards used to determine space allowances for new construction and using district/county office estimates of unhoused enrollments, $3.17 Billion is estimated to be needed to fund construction of schools to house the anticipated unhoused enrollment during the five year period 1986-87 to 1990-91.**

Cost of School Construction

During our discussions with some local educational units, they indicated that the $100 per square foot was an unreasonably low figure and that they could not construct schools within that dollar allowance, especially because of the high cost of obtaining land on which to construct the school. We discussed this concern with OLA and they indicated that the average incremental cost for land is relatively low since most funded construction is an expansion to existing schools. According to OLA staff, where new schools are needed, the district

often has a site, one can be purchased at low cost, or a developer will make land available. OLA estimated that site acquisition could be between 5-15 percent of total construction cost, probably tending closer to the lower percentage.

To further test the claim of the districts that they could not build for $100 a square foot, we reviewed some State funded projects from OLA's files where the construction was recently completed. Ten projects were reviewed including both elementary and high schools. These projects had total costs ranging from $80.46/sq. ft. to $117.76/sq. ft., with an average cost of $93.12 per square foot. Land costs ranged from zero to 17.4 percent of total project cost, with an average land cost for the reviewed projects of 2.3 percent. There appeared to be little difference between the cost per square foot of building elementary schools or high schools.

It should be noted that this may not be the case in some established urban areas. One urban district indicated that many city blocks of housing and businesses must be condemned to construct new schools if it is to meet its need to house its anticipated enrollments over the next five years.

**Conclusion: Based on our review, experience indicates that in most cases a school can be constructed within the $100 per square foot allowance used by OLA. Established urban areas may be an exception.**

Special Day Class
Unhoused Enrollment

Our survey did not deal with the added cost of providing housing for special day classes which are alloted additional space. We estimated an average of 100 additional square feet per special day

class student. To handle this omission, we used the 1983-84 special day class enrollment to determine special day class enrollment as a percent of regular enrollment for that year. This percentage then was applied against the district estimate of enrollment for 1990-91 to estimate the level of special day class enrollment for that year. The difference between current and projected special day class enrollment was considered as unhoused, thus deriving an estimate of up to $243 Million additional need to house special day class enrollment.[2]

**Finding: Based on a calculated estimate using district/county office enrollment projections, an additional $243 Million could be needed to house special day class enrollment by the year 1990-91.**

Non-Reporting Districts' Unhoused Enrollment

One concern regarding the estimating of need was how to deal with non-reporting districts. Our contacts in trying to obtain a submittal from the districts indicated that many of the non-reporting districts were projecting no unhoused enrollments for the period under study. Some of these districts, like a couple in Marin County, had substantial excess capacity that would adequately house any anticipated increase in enrollment. They, therefore, saw no need to submit a survey. However, we do know of a few non-submitting districts that may have a need. Two districts indicated that their reason for not reporting was to protest the Governor's veto of the school legislation; the others, mostly small

[2]Special day class enrollments were allotted an additional 100 square feet per enrollment, with a $100 per square foot construction cost.

districts, indicated they did not have the resources to complete the survey.

**Conclusion: The impact of the non-reporting districts with need, if any, would be minor, since the non-reporting districts generally were small enrollment districts.**

District Reported Rehabilitation Need

The survey instrument was designed to also collect information regarding the need to rehabilitate existing schools. Unfortunately, the results of our survey were not definitive in terms of rehabilitation needs.

There were two questions regarding the need for rehabilitating existing schools. The first question sought information on the number of classrooms which a district's facility utilization plan indicated have been or will be taken out-of-service due to the need to rehabilitate the classroom for continued use. Based on responses to this question, we estimate that $103 Million could be needed over the next five years to keep or to bring back this capacity on-line.

In addition, the district and county offices were asked to report the student capacity of their buildings that presently are at least 30 years old, which need rehabilitation, and are "worthy of rehabilitation". The estimate of the number of students that could be affected by this rehabilitation need is 1,138,139 students. Placing a dollar value on this reported need, the current, plus the next five year need

would require funding of $1.9 Billion, with an annual need for the current and next five years as follows:[3]

| | |
|---|---|
| 1985-86 | $1,186 Million |
| 1986-87 | $ 197 Million |
| 1987-88 | $ 145 Million |
| 1988-89 | $ 151 Million |
| 1989-90 | $ 117 Million |
| 1990-91 | $ 112 Million |

Again, similar to the method of determining construction costs for unhoused enrollments, we used the OLA standards for calculating the funding needed for rehabilitation. The Office of Local Assistance has set standards regarding what buildings may be rehabilitated. If the cost of rehabilitating a facility exceeds 25 percent of what it would cost to construct a similar building, rehabilitation funds will not be approved by OLA. To calculate the amount of funding to rehabilitate existing facilities, the same square footage standards as used to calculate the unhoused enrollment need were used; i.e., 55, 75 and 85/87 square feet per enrollment for K-6, 7-8 and 9-12 grade levels, respectively. Then we applied a $25 per square foot construction cost ($100 times the allowed 25 percent of the cost of new construction restriction) to determine the total level of needed funding.

---

[3]The Los Angeles Unified School District did not report any rehabilitation need in response to the survey. We are told that they have applied for existing rehabilitation funding for all buildings in the district that are 40 years old or older. In addition, some other districts did not report a need because the information was not available.

We believe, however, that the estimate of $1.9 Billion rehabilitation need should be viewed with some reservations and should be viewed as representing a maximum needed outlay under the worst conditions. Our reasons for this qualification are:

> As previously noted, district facility utilization plans excluded only a fraction of the reported capacity as being unusable during the next five years due to rehabilitation needs, with an estimated need of only $103 million. Viewed another way, it seems that the schools could and would continue to house students in much of the capacity that the districts ideally would like to rehabilitate.
>
> The OLA standard of 25 percent of the cost of new construction is a maximum; State funded rehabilitations can involve far less than the maximum of $25 per square foot used to derive the estimate.

Because of limited time and resources and the judgmental nature of the term "worthy of rehabilitation," the study team did not attempt to validate the reported need for rehabilitating classroom facilities. In addition, unlike the secondary sources available for enrollment projections, alternate data were not available for cross-checking the reported rehabilitation data.

> **Finding: Based on existing OLA standards and district reported need for rehabilitating existing facilities, under worst conditions, up to $1.9 Billion could be needed for the period 1985-86 to 1990-91.**
>
> **Conclusion: The magnitude of the indicated rehabilitation need should be viewed with some reservations.**

Analyst Adjustments

In the next Chapter we will discuss some factors that were observed during the field visits. These factors should be considered before a final determination is made regarding the level of needed funding for new facilities.

## CHAPTER IV

## ADJUSTMENTS FOR COMPARABILITY

In order to accurately understand what local districts and county offices were facing regarding enrollment growth and the need for additional school housing, the study team visited about half of the districts in 21 different counties. A second purpose for these visits was to validate the surveys that were submitted. As a further validation, project staff called many districts that had submitted incomplete information or information that appeared inconsistent with the instructions or other parts of the survey.

### District Selection For Visitation

A primary basis for selecting districts for visitation was the expected growth rate. The Governor's Education Advisor contacted several county superintendents to identify districts expected to have a high enrollment growth rate over the next five years. This process identified 107 districts.

After reviewing the list of identified districts, it was apparent that the list did not provide a representative geographical distribution, nor did it contain what could be considered a fair distribution of small, medium and large districts. For these reasons, Finance analysts examined other projections of enrollment growth and discussed the issue with others that could have knowledge of districts

expecting to experience a high growth in enrollments. As a result of this secondary effort, the list of districts selected for visitation was expanded to about 200.

The selected districts were visited between October 25 and November 15, 1985.

Survey Desk Audit

Beyond checking the survey forms during the site visits, all of the submitted questionnaires were desk audited and the district contacted by telephone if there were any significant questions regarding the submitted data or if material discrepancies were identified. The combination of visits and telephone calls resulted in the districts' submitted unhoused enrollment estimate being increased. Correspondingly, the needed funding for new construction was increased from just over $2.6 Billion to $3.17 Billion.

Adjustments To Unhoused Need

Generally, we found that most districts appeared to accurately represent their condition in the surveys that were submitted. However, the field visits and telephone contacts with the districts also yielded instances where a district had inadvertently omitted some capacity, had inconsistencies in reported information or seemed to overstate a district's unhoused need. Some districts, rather than following current policies, completed the questionnaire based on desired

policies; e.g., lower class size, single Kindergarten sessions instead of the present two sessions or not including district owned portable or relocatable facilities.[1] In some cases, districts reported alternate sets of data based on different assumptions, with one set of data labeled as the official response.

When the reporting errors or inconsistencies were identified, we discussed the items with the reporting district. If agreed to by a district, adjustments were made to the survey response and reflected in the $3.17 billion construction cost previously reported in Chapter III. In a few cases, however, the district declined to adjust its submitted data.

In these cases, if the district's reporting basis was in contradiction to the guidelines and to provide comparable data, adjustments were made to the district data.

Some of the adjustments made to provide a more refined basis for assessing current and prospective unhoused enrollments included:

> One district had included as unhoused, those students the State is presently paying to transport under a court desegregation order. To count these students as unhoused in the school of origin would double count students who are attending school at another facility with adequate space and would ignore the fact that the court had ordered the students moved to other sites to facilitate integration.

---

[1]While some districts have current policies for single session Kindergarten or designated class size, current housing situations may have forced them into different situations.

One district calculated its unhoused enrollment based on the elimination of Year Round Schools (YRS). We recalculated unhoused need to reflect YRS since it is a current district policy and, in fact, the district expects to expand its use of YRS.

For another district, we adjusted the unhoused need to reflect capacity from presently closed schools based on the assumption that the district would reopen the schools when faced with a demand for space.

One district declined to include 30 district owned portable classrooms in its capacity data.

Another district had a high school site used for another purpose that it omitted from its capacity.

Another assumed the passage of State legislation to reduce class size (not passed), thus reporting a lower capacity.

A district disregarded some owned portable space and also discounted high school space by 10 percent.

The effect of the above types of adjustments was to reduce the aggregate unhoused enrollment for the 21 visited counties by 45,931 students--a reduction of $285 million.

Adjusted Estimate Of Needed Funding For Unhoused Enrollments

To determine the effect the above adjustments would have on the statewide reported unhoused need, the total unhoused need reported by the visited counties was compared to the downward adjustment, thus deriving an "adjustment" factor.

The assumption then was made that other non-visited respondents to the questionnaire had similar reporting discrepancies in their

reports and, therefore, that the aggregate need reported by all respondents to the questionnaire could be revised by the adjustment factor. This reduced the overall need for funding unhoused enrollments to $2.833 Billion, still about $200 Million above what the districts originally reported.

The adjusted need occurs over the next five years as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1986-87 | $ 820.8 Million |
| 1987-88 | $ 380.7 Million |
| 1988-89 | $ 461.8 Million |
| 1989-90 | $ 536.9 Million |
| 1990-91 | $ 633.1 Million |
| Total = | $2,833.3 Million |

**Conclusion: A more accurate estimate of need for new construction funding to house anticipated unhoused enrollments is $2.833 Billion over the next five years.**

It is important to note that, while the schools have reported a need for space which could cost $2.8 Billion to construct, they would not actually be eligible for State funding for this amount under current State standards. Many districts based their projections of unhoused need upon assumptions which are inconsistent with the State's policies; for example, many districts calculated their "unhoused need" using class sizes which are significantly lower than the sizes which the State uses to determine eligibility. Using two counties to project such differences, we estimate that the $2.8 Billion may be 10 to 15 percent higher than the amount that would actually be approved under the State's current standards for qualifying for State construction assistance.

As a result of reducing unhoused enrollments and because of the methodology used to calculate the need for Special Day Classes, it was necessary to apply the adjustment factor to that estimate. This resulted in an adjusted need for Special Day Class facilities of $228 Million.

**Conclusion: A more accurate estimate of the need for Special Day Class space funding based on anticipated enrollments is $228 Million.**

Summary of The Adjusted Need for New Construction And Rehabilitation Funding

After adjusting for findings from field visits, we conclude that the need for new construction, Special Day Class space and rehabilitation funding over the next five years is:

| | |
|---|---|
| New Construction | $2.833 Billion |
| Special Day Classes | .228 Billion |
| Rehabilitation | Up to $1.908 Billion |

As noted previously, the figure for rehabilitation probably should be viewed with some reservations.

Under present policies, the above amounts appear to accurately reflect what would be needed to house the anticipated enrollments and to rehabilitate schools eligible for such rehabilitation. However, we found many policies that should be viewed as candidates for change if a well-managed school housing program is to be developed. Moreover, changes to these policies could reduce the indicated need for State funding. These policies will be discussed in the next Chapter.

## CHAPTER V

## CONSIDERATIONS FOR A NEW SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAM

The current field visits to local schools, plus the previous involvement by some members of the study team in similar studies, provided an insight into many district policies and procedures that result in increased costs to both the local district and the State in providing the local education program. It appears that all parties could gain from focusing attention to the options discussed below, with the result that more resources would be available to enhance the education of California's school population, both now and in the future. Continuing these current policies and practices will only result in continuing pressures upon our educational resources.

### Designing and Building Using the Yield Curve

In order not to repeat the current dilemma regarding educational facilities in California--empty schools where there are no students and overcrowded schools where the population is growing--school building programs need to recognize more than just the current need to house students. Designers and builders of schools must focus greater attention on the long range cycles of the student yield curve.[1]

[1]Yield is defined as the number of public school students per household within a specified attendance area. The yield curve reflects the variation in yield over time.

Currently, the enrollment yield rate is updated by many large districts when actual enrollments differ from what was expected based on the historic yield rate. Generally, this is done when overcrowding is experienced, rather than when enrollments are declining; hence, creating a bias towards high yield rates which then are applied as comparable rates in other yield projections.

Noting the large amount of unused educational capacity and the numerous school facilities that have been diverted to other uses, we explored the variation in yield rates throughout the State. Based on the 1980 census, yield rates per household for public school students ranged from a low of less than 0.1 (presumably in mature areas) to over 1.5.

To some extent, variations in the yield rate are a function of the different stages of growth of a community or attendance area. When a community has new construction, the yield rate usually climbs at a rapid rate, generally reflecting a younger, child-bearing age population moving into the new housing. As the children age and complete their education, they move from the community, resulting in a drop in the yield curve and excess capacity in the schools that were built during the time of rapidly increasing demand for school facilities. Later, as the area undergoes a renaissance, the yield curve again may rise, but probably stopping short of its previous peak.

The phenomenon of the yield curve is instructive with respect to how we ought to design and build our school facilities. In order to avoid future excess school capacity in mature communities; e.g., San Francisco and Marin Counties, schools should be designed to have a brick and mortar facility based on the "lowest" expected yield rate

from a "mature" community. This could result in using in a yield rate as low as 0.25 K-12 students per household, or lower. The rest of the school facility would be relocatable facilities that can be moved, when needed, to places of future high growth. Different rates should be developed for the different grade levels. The rates cited above are aggregate rates for all grade levels.

Presently, the Office of Local Assistance reflects this factor by requiring 10 percent of a new facility to be relocatable or portable. We would suggest that this percentage is far too low and should be revised to limit future unused capacity.

**Recommendation: School facilities built with State funds should require a major portion of the facility to be portable or relocatable facilities. The actual amount should be determined by the Office of Local Assistance.**

The Yield Rate
And Immigrants

The discussion of the yield curve has meaning when dealing with normal changes in a community. However, several areas of the State presently are facing an abnormal growth period due to an influx of immigrants. In a normal setting, the yield curve would decline as a community matures, and then will start to rise as an area is revitalized, the rise generally stopping short of its previous peak.

Several communities in California, notably in the southern part of the State, are housing and educating a school age population two times and more what the area experienced at its previous peak housing yield. We are told of an immigrant population that has entered the area, usually at the lowest socioeconomic level, making do with

whatever housing and jobs are available. In many cases, several families, in violation of zoning and health and safety ordinances, live in housing designed to accommodate a single family. The result is that these areas, which in the absence of the immigrant population would be experiencing excess capacity or at least adequate capacity, now are faced with crowded facilities, double-session Kindergartens, Year-Round schools and an abundance of temporary classrooms placed on existing school sites. And still the area lacks sufficient classroom space to educate its school age population.

What is the relevance of this situation to this study? These circumstances, some resulting from community actions, have resulted in abnormalities in demands upon community services including education. Now these communities find themselves looking to the State for financial support to build additional classroom infra-structure, although the underlying cause of the population surge may be temporary and could be mitigated by local government actions.

Although other communities also have experienced an influx of immigrants, presumably by enforcing existing zoning and housing ordinances they have absorbed their influx in a geographically distributed fashion, thus minimizing the concentration and impact on a specific area. The advantage is that these communities are not faced with overcrowding existing school facilities and a need to purchase large blocks of existing low-income housing and small businesses in order to create sites for new schools.

**Recommendation: The Legislature and Governor, in enacting legislation to deal with school facility construction, should give consideration to developing policies relating to these abnormal immigration patterns.**

Design Of "Standard"
School Buildings

A visit to California schools will find facilities of varying shapes and sizes. In recent contacts with private sector developers of commercial and business space, we hear of their current efforts to reduce the cost of development, while still maintaining the individual character of each building. Their approach to construction is to develop standardized structural designs; i.e., building cores, differentiating each building with varying facades.

Schools do not seem to use this practice; instead, each facility is a unique creation. Presently, considerable time is spent by local districts, working with local architects, developing individual school designs and plans. Subsequently, as they work their way through the State's funding process these plans undergo extensive State level review for compliance with the many specialized requirements the State has imposed on school design and construction. We question whether this is a wise expenditure of State and local funds.

It appears that local school districts and the State could learn from the direction that the private sector is taking to lower its development costs. We have been advised that standardized school models were used in the past, but have been abandoned in favor of allowing local design preferences. It seems that the situation which many districts face regarding unhoused enrollments calls for every effort to minimize the cost of building urgently needed school capacity. It may

be time to consider returning to standardized school designs to gain the potential savings.

**Recommendation: The Office of Local Assistance should evaluate the potential savings that could result from standardized designs and incorporate a requirement for use of standardized designs for districts seeking State funding if the savings so warrant.**

Use of School Buildings

From our visits and reviews of survey forms, it was apparent that the local districts have substantial classroom capacity, previously used to house students, that has been redirected to alternate use during the period of low enrollments. Faced with a need for additional school housing, districts are approaching this diverted space from differing perspectives. There are districts that presently intend to reclaim this space, and so reflected the additional capacity in their survey submittals. Other districts' have taken the opposite direction; i.e., intending to keep their excess capacity in alternate uses and thus including in their surveys a resulting need for additional space.

Our concern in this area is two-fold. First, many districts have this space leased out for profit; raising the question of whether the rest of the State should be asked to fund new buildings for such districts while they continue to collect their lease payments? Secondly, if we allow the first to occur, it is likely that those intending to reclaim the space will change their minds and look to the State to provide replacement capacity. This will affect the reported need for funding to construct schools.

While OLA presently will include excess space in alternate uses in capacity, we are told that it is possible for districts to redefine boundaries, especially for K-6 attendance areas, to exclude this space. In this way districts can retain their excess space in its alternate use and still be eligible for State funding for a new facility.

> **Recommendation: The Office of Local Assistance should review this situation and incorporate requirements, if necessary, to assure that districts do not circumvent the intent of the OLA standards by inappropriately redefining attendance areas. In addition, OLA should consider a requirement that the income from any "unavailable" facilities in the district be required as "additional" local match for any State funded district school construction.[2]**

State Standards For
Counting Existing Space

Districts were asked to comment on the State's method of counting existing space. There seemed to be two focuses to this discussion:

> Should certain areas of a school; e.g., overhangs and covered walkways; be counted against a district in determining existing capacity when they apply for new construction funding; and
>
> Do the current Office of Local Assistance standards for space allocation; e.g., 55 sq. ft. for K-6, etc., reflect contemporary needs?

---

[2]The "fair market value" should be used to determine the required match since, in some cases, the lease income may be artificially low. In one district visited by the study team the district had rejected an offer by a private school to pay $250,000 per year for a closed facility and accepted $25,000 per year from a "community" group.

Before the current standards were developed, schools were built as the local district's wishes dictated. Now, many of these areas are experiencing enrollment growth and require additional school capacity. In determining eligibility for funding, OLA reviews the district's existing space, using the current standards. Under these standards, many districts come up short because of prior building practices. Given the prevalence of the comments received on this point, there probably is some credence to this complaint with respect to existing space. In terms of applying these standards to future space, there were few comments.

**Recommendation: The Office of Local Assistance should review the application of the current standards to existing space, especially for existing space built prior to the development of the standards.**

With respect to whether the standards reflect contemporary needs, the prevalent comments in the survey returns were that the standards are far too low. At the same time, however, the survey forms reflected large amounts of classroom space used for pull-out programs. It appears that districts have accommodated their needs through the redirection of existing facilities.

However, study teams did visit a few schools that had recently built to the State standards. The comments received from the site administrators and staffs indicated that, while they always would like more space, they were offering quality educational programs within the State standards. This was not a major focus of our study, hence the positive responses may be isolated instances. Beyond this, we have no definitive information to provide on this issue.

**Recommendation: The Office of Local Assistance should initiate a study to review the appropriateness of the current space standards.**

Leased/Portable Classrooms
As School Capacity

School districts vary greatly in the manner in which they make use of portable/relocatable classroom space and in the way they obtain this space; i.e., whether they lease the facility or buy it. For a district facing a future building program, there can be a significant impact depending upon the lease/purchase decision made.

In reviewing the present capacity of a district that is applying for funding, the Office of Local Assistance does not count leased portable facilities as a part of capacity; only owned facilities are counted. We were told by a district that their lease decision was made specifically so that they would continue to be eligible for State funding. This incentive can lead to inefficient short-run lease/purchase decisions. It also can force districts to go to great lengths to avoid acquiring facilities which count toward their capacity. We know of one district that buys its portables, resells them to a joint powers entity, and then leases them back ... just for the purpose of avoiding counting them as capacity.

**Recommendation: When measuring the current enrollment capacity of a district, the Office of Local Assistance should count all facilities, both leased and owned, if the facility is of sufficient quality to house students. Very short term leases may be an exception.**

Local Prerogative/

Local Pay

A review of the questionnaires and discussions with several local school district officials, indicated a preference for minimum State control on the facilities built with State fundings, leaving the local districts the flexibility to accommodate local preferences for education. Among the flexibility items desired were:

Larger classrooms--One district official noted that students have become bigger and taller during the past 15-20 years so they need more space;

Building new schools instead of changing attendance areas;

Building more classrooms to achieve lower class sizes.

While many may agree with the importance of local interests as a principle, school buildings are only one of many priorities that need to be addressed by government. And when government does address an issue, it needs to assure everyone that there is an equitable allocation to all participants. The way this normally is accomplished is through standards such as those applied to buildings funded through the State's building program. Furthermore, standards are needed to keep the funding allocation within bounds; otherwise, there may be insufficient funds to meet the total needs identified. This is especially important for those rapidly expanding communities in which there is no alternative to new school construction. Providing every

student in the State with a classroom seat seems to be a reasonable first priority, much more pressing than enhancing the space of students already housed.

**Recommendation: The Office of Local Assistance should retain standards with respect to the type and quality of facility for which it will provide construction aid. If the local district desires enhanced features in its facilities, the cost of these features should remain a local responsibility.**

## A Local Share And How To Pay For It

There seems to be no inherent reason that some portion of new facility costs should not be borne by the local school district. In fact, schools that are growing may be in the best position to contribute to school construction costs from their revenue limit apportionments. For example, growing districts usually add many new teachers and other staff that are paid far less than more experienced staff. The average new classroom teacher in 1984-85 was paid $17,639, which is $9,056 less than the average classroom teacher salary of $26,695, and $14,494 less than the highest teacher salary. These savings could be used by expanding districts to pay for a portion of their higher facility costs.

**Recommendation: Local districts should pay a share of all construction projects funded by the State.**

## Rehabilitation Funding and Facility Maintenance

School districts reported only $103 million as the cost of rehabilitating facilities which would have to be removed from service

due to rehabilitation needs over the next five years. They reported a much higher cost--$1.9 billion--as the amount of rehabilitation funding for which they would be eligible. This discrepancy suggests that there may be some problems with the current eligibility criteria for State rehabilitation funding.

In addition, the availability of State rehabilitation funding appears to act as a disincentive for districts to provide prudent levels of ongoing maintenance to their facilities using local and State-match funding. Districts can ignore their maintenance needs--especially on older buildings which qualify for State rehabilitation funds--and apply for this "extra" State rehabilitation money to remedy all of the deferred maintenance needs at one time at 100 percent State expense. Some districts told the study staff that they have adopted this strategy.

It is unfortunate the availability of State rehabilitation funds provides an incentive for school district managers to fail to maintain their facilities, even to the point of failing to have a deferred maintenance program using State matching funds. In a prior study of deferred maintenance, it was found that deterioration accelerated over time and the cost of repairs, therefore, increases. We believe the State should encourage districts to provide prudent maintenance of the large public investment in their physical plants. This could be accomplished by requiring that districts fully utilize their allocation of State matching funds for deferred maintenance for some number of years as a condition of applying for rehabilitation funding.

Recommendation: The Office of Local Assistance should review its basis for determining eligibility for rehabilitation funding to determine:

1. if the current criteria for eligibility are discrete enough to provide funding for only those facilities truly in need of rehabilitation; and

2. if the criteria can be modified to include an incentive for an ongoing maintenance program.

APPENDIX A

GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN
GOVERNOR

State of California
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

DATE: September 23, 1985

TO: ALL DISTRICT AND COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS:

FROM: BILL CUNNINGHAM Bill
Advisor to the Governor
for Education

RE: SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Attached is the questionnaire I alerted you to in my letter of September 10, 1985.

Please note it is in two parts, with two different return dates. I realize this is a complicated questionnaire, but it is critically important that we receive the most complete data you have available. Believe it or not, there is just no such data-base available anywhere in the State—it has never been accumulated. The Governor is anxious to address this important issue, but only after he has thorough data upon which to make a decision. Your response is important to this office and to the Governor.

Thank you very much for your immediate attention and cooperation on this matter.

WLC/chg

September 23, 1985

# GOVERNOR'S OFFICE SURVEY of K-12 SCHOOL FACILITIES NEEDS

Prepared by


Assistant to the Governor for Education
Bill Cunningham (916) 323-0611

Department of Finance
Walt Schaff (916) 322-2730
Moti Malkani (916) 322-6640


(Any questions regarding completion of the survey questionnaire may be directed to the Department of Finance staff.)

SURVEY CONTENTS:

Part 1 - Facility Needs. Please complete and return by October 15, 1985

Part 2 - Classroom Units. Optional, but request return by November 15, 1985

Please mail both Parts to: Bill Cunningham
C/O Department of Finance
1025 P Street, Room 359
Sacramento, CA 95814

NAME OF DISTRICT: _____

COUNTY _____ DISTRICT CODE _____ (Please enter the seven digit district level CDS Code listed in the Public School Directory)

PERSON(s) COMPLETING FORM:

Name (print) _____

Title _____ Phone _____

Name (print) _____

Title _____ Phone _____

DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT:

Name (print) _____

Signature _____

Title _____ Phone _____

## PART 1 - FACILITIES NEEDS

DISTRICT CODE_____ (Please enter the seven digit district level CDS Code listed in the Public School Directory)

### SECTION I -- NEW CONSTRUCTION NEEDS

A. District Enrollment Projections. Include enrollment for continuation schools, special education classes and other categorical education programs, but exclude summer school, adult education, ROC/ROP programs and child development (e.g., pre school) programs.

| Year | Enrollment by Grade Level | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1-6 | 7-8 | 9-12 | Total |
| Actual 1983-84[a/] | | | | | |
| Actual 1984-85[a/] | | | | | |
| Estimated 1985-86[a/] | | | | | |
| Projected 1986-87 | | | | | |
| Projected 1987-88 | | | | | |
| Projected 1988-89 | | | | | |
| Projected 1989-90 | | | | | |
| Projected 1990-91 | | | | | |

a/Report unduplicated enrollment reported to the Department of Education on the CBEDS Form for the indicated year.

Please describe the assumptions and method of developing the enrollment projections. Use additional sheets if necessary.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

DISTRICT CODE_____

B. Which is/are the determining factor(s) for the pupil-to-teacher loading ratios based on student enrollment? Please check all appropriate factors.

__ Collective bargaining agreements
__ Court ordered mandate
__ Other (describe) _____
__ District policy
__ State class size penalties

On the two tables below, please report the 1985-86 pupil-to-teacher loading ratios for the indicated classes.

Regular Education Classes

| | Ratios by Grade Level | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1-3 | 4-6 | 7-8 | 9-12 |
| Pupil-to-Teacher Ratio | | | | | |

Categorical Education Classes

| | Special Education | | | Miller Unruh | Migrant Education | Infant Program | ECIA/EIA Proj. Rm | GATE Prg. | Other 1/ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pupil-to-Teacher Ratio | RSP | DIS | SDC | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

1/ If other categorical classes are provided, compute and enter an average ratio.

Please provide any clarifying comments regarding district's loading policy. Use additional sheets if necessary._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. On Attachment A, please list individually any district owned, leased or lease/purchased improved real property which presently is used for regular K-12 education or support purposes or has been used for such purposes in the past. In addition, please indicate current use(s) of each site and note with an "*" if the site fails to meet Field Act requirements.

D. Of the total number (_____) of classrooms, how many are currently used for pull out programs? _____

E. What percentage of current enrollment is involved in pull out programs? _____

DISTRICT CODE_____

F. Current (1985-86) Housing Capacity: Under CURRENT DISTRICT POLICIES, how many students (per enrollment definition in Question A.) could the district facilities house at the following grade levels if all district owned and leased school facilities were used to their MAXIMUM CAPACITY for K-12 education or related support purposes? Include any facility still owned by the district that currently meets Field Act requirements and has been used for such purposes in the past even if not presently used for those purposes. Exclude any facilities that are currently planned or in process of becoming usable but presently are not available for housing students. In the table below, please ENTER TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS THAT COULD BE HOUSED in district facilities.

| | Maximum Capacity (Students) by Grade Level | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | K | 1-6 | 7-8 | 9-12 |
| Number of Students | | | | | |

G. Based on 1985-86 enrollment as reported in Question A, how are students presently housed?

| Grade Level and Type of Housing | Number of Students Currently housed in | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Conventional School | Extended Day Program[2/] | Year Round School | Other (specify) |
| K Permanent Housing[1/] | | | | |
| K Interim Housing[1/] | | | | |
| 1-6 Permanent Housing | | | | |
| 1-6 Interim Housing | | | | |
| 7-8 Permanent Housing | | | | |
| 7-8 Interim Housing | | | | |
| 9-12 Permanent Housing | | | | |
| 9-12 Interim Housing | | | | |

1/ Permanent housing means a fixed/stationary structure, including lease/purchase buildings, portables and relocatables not planned for replacement within the next five years. Interim housing means any leased, portable, relocatable or trailer facility presently used to house students which is planned for replacement within the next five years.

2/ Extended day programs mean any alteration in scheduling to permit more extensive use of school facilities.

DISTRICT CODE_____

6. (Continued) Are there any mitigating factors (affecting the way students are housed) caused by special education and other pull out programs? Please explain. Use additional sheets if necessary.

H. Other than using space in existing school facilities, how is the district housing the 1985-86 student population? Please check each applicable method.

| | |
|---|---|
| ___ Using Extended School Days | ___ Using Space in Non-school Bldgs. |
| ___ Using Space in Neighboring School Districts | ___ Using a Joint Occupancy Plan |
| ___ Using Year Round Schools | ___ Other (specify)_____ |
| ___ Using Leased Space | ___ _____ |

If these and other options, including any not listed above, may be used WITHIN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, please explain. Use additional sheets if necessary.

DISTRICT CODE_____

I. Based on current district policies, will the district have unhoused student populations during the next five years? (Unhoused population is defined as any student NOT HOUSED in a district owned permanent or portable/relocatable facility.) Yes___ No___. If yes, please complete table below.

| Year | Unhoused Enrollment by Grade Level | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1-6 | 7-8 | 9-12 | Total |
| 1986-87 | | | | | |
| 1987-88 | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | |

Please explain the district's assumptions and method of computing unhoused population projections. Use additional sheets, if necessary.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

J. Does your facility utilization plan exclude any existing classrooms which are not or will not be used for regular K-12 education or support purposes principally because they require REHABILITATION? Yes___ No___. If yes, please complete table below.

| Year | Number of Unused Classrooms Requiring Rehabilitation by Grade Level | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1-6 | 7-8 | 9-12 | Total |
| 1985-86 | | | | | |
| 1986-87 | | | | | |
| 1987-88 | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | |

DISTRICT CODE_____

L. Does your facility utilization plan exclude any existing classrooms which are not or will not be used for regular K-12 education or support purposes principally because of SHIFTS IN STUDENT POPULATION? Yes___ No___. If yes, please complete table below.

| Year | Number of Unused Classrooms Because of Enrollment Shifts by Grade Level | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1-6 | 7-8 | 9-12 | Total |
| 1985-86 | | | | | |
| 1986-87 | | | | | |
| 1987-88 | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | |

If any classroom is not or will not be used because of enrollment shifts, what is the district's policy on the maximum miles or travel time to transport pupils to under-utilized facilities? Please explain. Also, please add any other comments about additional district policies that impact the use of available classrooms.

DISTRICT CODE_____

M. Has the district constructed or rehabilitated any school facility during the past three years OR does the district plan to construct or rehabilitate any facility within the next five years? Yes___ No___ If yes, in the table below please indicate which of the following funding mechanisms the district used during the past three years (1983 thru 1985) to finance additional housing. Also, if known, please indicate which mechanism(s) the district plans to use or is considering to use within the next five years (1986 thru 1990) to finance housing needs. PLEASE CIRCLE Y for YES or N for NO.

FUNDING MECHANISMS

| Options | Past Years | Next five years | | Comments, if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Planned | Considering | |
| 1. Sale of Property | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 2. Lease of Property | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 3. Lease-Purchase Agreements | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 4. Non-Profit or Charitable Found. | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 5. Mello-Roos Comm. Facilities | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 6. Tax Increment Financing | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 7. Special Taxes | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 8. Benefit or Special Assessments | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 9. Certificates of Participation | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 10. Developer Fees | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 11. Mitigation Fees | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 12. Impact Fees (SB 201) | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 13. State Funds | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 14. Local Revenue Bonds | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 15. Local General Obligation Bonds | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 16. Other Local Funds | Y N | Y N | Y N | |
| 17. Other (Describe) | Y N | Y N | Y N | |

Please provide any clarifying comments. Use additional sheets if necessary.

## SECTION II -- REHABILITATION NEEDS

A. What is the student capacity of the district's buildings that presently are at least 30 years old which NEED REHABILITATION and are buildings that you believe ARE WORTHY OF REHABILITATION? Please report need for the indicated years.

| Grade Level | Number of Students by Fiscal Year | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1985-86 | 1986-87 | 1987-88 | 1988-89 | 1989-90 | 1990-91 |
| K | | | | | | |
| 1-6 | | | | | | |
| 7-8 | | | | | | |
| 9-12 | | | | | | |

## SECTION III -- AIR CONDITIONING AND OTHER NEEDS

A. If the district were to operate a year round school program, would the facilities need to be air conditioned? Yes____ No____. If yes, what percentage of total district square foot capacity IS PRESENTLY air conditioned?_____. What ADDITIONAL percentage would need to be air conditioned? _____

B. What other facility modifications would be required to permit greater utilization (e.g., extended day or year round use) of the facilities? Please describe the modifications and estimate the percentage of current capacity that would need to be changed FOR EACH TYPE OF MODIFICATION.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

DISTRICT CODE_____

## SECTION IV -- SPACE STANDARDS

A. Are the current State space standards (i.e., 55 sq. ft. per K-6 ADA, 75 sq. ft. per 7-8 ADA and 85 or 87 sq. ft. per 9-12 ADA) adequate to house district enrollment? Yes ____ No____ Why? Use additional sheets if necessary.

_____

_____

_____

_____

## SECTION V -- BUDGET DATA

A. In the table below, please report the beginning fiscal year balance for each of the designated restricted funds.

July 1 Beginning Balance

| Fund Name | 1983-84 | 1984-85 | 1985-86 |
|---|---|---|---|
| State Building Fund | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Fund | | | |
| Foundation Fund | | | |
| Impact/Mitigation Fund | | | |
| Developer Fee Fund | | | |

B. In the table below, please report the dollar expenditure and source of funds--i.e., General Fund (GF), State Building Fund (SBF), Deferred Maintenance Fund (DMF), Foundation Fund (FF), Impact/Mitigation Fund (IMF), Developer Fee Fund (DFF) or other (please specify)--for the selected items.

| | Actual 1983-84 | | Actual 1984-85 | | Estimated 1985-86 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dollars Expended For: | Amount | Source | Amount | Source | Amount | Source |
| Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | |
| Asbestos Abatement | | | | | | |
| Rehabilitation | | | | | | |
| New space/construction | | | | | | |
| Handicapped Access | | | | | | |

DISTRICT CODE_____

September 23, 1985
Part 1 - Attachment A

## LIST OF DISTRICT PROPERTIES AND THEIR USAGE

In the table below, list individually each district owned, leased or lease/purchased improved real property which presently is used for regular K-12 education or support purposes. Also list any other owned, leased or lease/purchased real property that has been used for such purposes in the past, even though it may not be used for those purposes now. For property, list the site name, address, present use(s) and indicate with an "**" if the facilities fail to meet Field Act requirements. Use additional sheets if necessary.

| Site Name | Address | Current Use | Fails Field Act |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

District Code _____

September 23, 1985

PART 2 - CLASSROOM UNITS
of
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE SURVEY OF K-12 SCHOOL FACILITY NEEDS

Report of Classroom Units

The return of this part of the Governor's Office survey of K-12 school facility needs is requested by October 15, 1985. However, if the October 15 deadline cannot be met, its RETURN IS REQUESTED BY NOVEMBER 15, 1985, if possible. When completed, please mail the form to:

Bill Cunningham
C/O Department of Finance
1025 P Street, Room 359
Sacramento, CA 95814

The purpose of this section is to determine the number of classrooms and classroom equivalent space currently available in school districts and the purposes for which this space is being utilized. In accordance with Education Code Section 56730.5 (Chapter 115, Statutes of 1985), the "Classroom Units" format is being utilized in collecting the data because districts and county offices will be required to report the data in this format on the J-380 "Annual Program Cost Data Report" (formerly the J-41-A) at the end of this (1985-86) fiscal year. Districts and county offices were notified in June about this requirement, which is a part of the FMAC (Financial Management and Accountability Committee) proposals to reform the annual financial statements. The data collected for this document can be used in completing that report as well, so that compiling the data now will mean a change in the timing of a job which will have to be accomplished in any case.

Detailed instructions for reporting the data, with appropriate examples, are included on the report form. Include all space owned or leased by your district, whether or not it is currently being used. Facilities being utilized by a district or county other than the owning district should be reported by the district owning the facility.

## INSTRUCTIONS

Districts currently utilizing the Square Footage Method to allocate Maintenance and Operations costs will need to convert to the Classroom Units Method. This should be a relatively simple change and will be easier to maintain in the future. This method will also be used to allocate certain program costs on the J-380 "Annual Program Cost Data Report".

The information is reported on the basis of the number of classroom units utilized by each program activity. One "unit" represents the approximate area usually occupied by a classroom, varying from 800 to 1,100 square feet, but generally about 960 square feet. Any classroom between 800 and 1,100 square feet is counted as 1.0 Classroom Unit, while classrooms larger or smaller are converted to C.U.s by dividing by 960 square feet.

Classroom units shared by two programs are reported to both programs on the basis of the number of hours the room is used by each program.

Commonly used floor spaces such as corridors, rest rooms, boiler rooms, etc., are not reported. Large spaces (cafeterias, gyms, etc.) or small spaces (cubicles for speech therapy, etc.) are converted to Classroom Units on the basis of 960 square feet per unit, rounded to the nearest .25 C.U.

### EXAMPLE

The Cafeteria of an elementary school is 70' x 80' in area, a total of 5,600 square feet. The cafeteria represents 5.75 C.U.'s (5,600 ÷ 960 = 5.83, rounded to 5.75 C.U.'s). The Cafeteria is used a total of eight hours per day: by the Food Services program 4 hours per day; by the teachers for gym classes 2 hours per day; and for community recreation activities 2 hours per day. Classroom Units would be established as follows:

1. Food Services Program:

   $\left[\frac{4}{8} \text{ hours} = .5\right] \times 5.75$ total C.U.'s = 2.87 C.U.'s rounded to 2.75 C.U.'s

2. General Instruction:

   $\left[\frac{2}{8} \text{ hours} = .25\right] \times 5.75$ total C.U.'s = 1.44 C.U.'s rounded to 1.50 C.U.'s

3. Community Services:

   $\left[\frac{2}{8} \text{ hours} = .25\right] \times 5.75$ total C.U.'s = 1.44 C.U.'s rounded to 1.50 C.U.'s

TOTAL 5.75 C.U.'s

## INSTRUCTIONS

An example of determining Classroom Unit counts is described below:

EXAMPLE: DISTRICT CLASSROOM UNITS

| | Total C.U. |
|---|---|
| General Ed., Elementary | 20 |
| General Ed., High School | 14 |
| Special Ed., SDC | 5 |
| Special Ed., RSP | 2 |
| Special Ed., DIS @ 1 classroom + 15' x 20' area | 1.25 |
| ECIA, Chapter 1 | 3 |
| Cafeterias: 2 @ 70' x 80' = 11.75 C.U.'s | 8.75 |
| Food Services @ 6 hrs. per day = 75% x 11.75 | |
| Community Services (Recreation) @ 2 hrs. per day = 25% x 11.75 | 3 |
| District Office (100' x 115') | 12 |
| Maintenance & Operations: 50' x 100' | 5.25 |
| Transportation 60' x 110' | 7 |
| TOTAL C.U.'s | 81.25 |

District Code _____

September 23, 1985



REPORT OF CLASSROOM UNITS
(Please refer to the instructions to complete this form)

| Program Activity | Classroom Units (C.U.'s) |
|---|---|
| GENERAL EDUCATION: | |
| Regular Education (K-12) | |
| Alternative Schools | |
| Community Schools | |
| Continuation Education | |
| Integration/ Desegregation Programs | |
| Independent Study Centers | |
| Opportunity Schools/ Programs | |
| ROC/P | |
| SPECIAL ED. MASTER PLAN: (Including PL94-142 Local Entitlement Expenditures) | |
| Special Day Class | |
| Designated Instruction and Services | |
| Nonpublic Schools | |
| Program Specialists/ Regionalized Services | |
| Special Ed. Transportation | |
| SPECIAL PROJECTS, FEDERAL | |
| Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) | |
| Vocational Ed. Act (VEA) | |

| Program Activity | Classroom Units (C.U.'s) |
|---|---|
| SPECIAL PROJECTS, FEDERAL (continued): | |
| ECIA, Chapter I, Regular | |
| ECIA, Chapter I, N & D | |
| ECIA, Chapter II | |
| ECIA, Other | |
| EESA (Math & Science) | |
| EOA, Head Start | |
| EOA, Other | |
| PL94-142 Discretionary Projects | |
| All Other Federal Projects | |
| SPECIAL PROJECTS, STATE: | |
| Classroom Teacher Instructional Employment Program | |
| Economic Impact Aid (EC 34028, 52168) | |
| Education Improvement Incentive Program | |
| Education Technology Assistance Grants | |
| Gifted & Talented Pupils | |
| Master Teacher Program | |
| Miller-Unruh Reading Act | |
| School Improvement Programs | |
| Staff Development (AB331, Article 1) | |
| Migrant Education | |

REPORT OF CLASSROOM UNITS
(Please refer to the instructions to complete this form)

| Program Activity | Classroom Units (C.U.'s) |
|---|---|
| Teacher Education and Computer Centers | |
| State Hospital Students, Special Education | |
| State Preschool | |
| Tenth Grade Counseling | |
| All Other State Projects | |
| LOCAL PROJECTS, (specify): | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| All Other Local Projects | |
| INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT: | |
| Instructional Administration | |
| Special Project Administration | |
| Instructional Media | |
| School Administration | |
| Pupil Services | |
| GENERAL SUPPORT: | |
| District Administration | |
| Maintenance | |
| Operations | |
| Transportation | |
| Data Processing | |
| AUXILIARY PROGRAMS: | |
| Community Services | |
| Food Services | |
| Non-District Activities Instructional | |
| Child Development | |
| Adult Education | |

| Program Activity | Classroom Units (C.U.'s) |
|---|---|
| All other space not previously reported (Exclude commonly used spaces such as corridors, restrooms, boiler rooms, etc.): Instructional | |
| Non-Instructional | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| TOTAL CLASSROOM UNITS | |

APPENDIX B

COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF TEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS[a/]

| Appln. # 22 - | District | Date Of Budget Revision | County | Revised Budget Approval ($) For: Site | Plans | Construction | Tests and Inspection | Furniture and Equipment | Contingencies | Total Budget | Acres | Square Feet | ADA | Total Budget per Sq. Ft. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary Schools | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20801 | | 10/82 | San Benito | 384,325 | 216,318 | 2,147,793 | 61,038 | 136,840 | 87,060 | 3,033,374 | 12.58 | 29,877 | 538 | $88.67 |
| 14201 | | 11/82 | San Joaquin | 652,500 | 224,564 | 2,511,943 | 58,600 | 125,948 | 178,678 | 3,752,233 | 10.7 | 37,900 | 505 | 81.78 |
| High Schools | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10501 | | 2/81 | Los Angeles | -0- | $ 203,669 | $11,455,275 | $ 73,000 | $ 237,884 | 181,547 | $12,151,375 | 40.0 | 110,430 | 1,256 | 110.04 |
| 11101 | | 11/81 | Riverside | -0- | 477,232 | 6,004,955 | 127,084 | 514,056 | 108,849 | 7,232,176 | N/A | 89,889 | 978 | 80.46 |
| 10101 | | 3/82 | El Dorado | -0- | 594,503 | 7,515,099 | 142,400 | 441,880 | 132,409 | 8,826,291 | N/A | 97,192 | 1,049 | 90.81 |
| 11901 | | 5/82 | San Bernardino | 6,000 | 458,705 | 6,734,499 | 113,380 | 583,079 | 120,435 | 8,016,098 | 40.0 | 95,322 | 1,062 | 84.09 |
| 14701 | | 10/82 | Riverside | 5,000 | 232,164 | 2,592,600 | 55,800 | 101,402 | 149,348 | 3,136,314 | N/A | 36,972 | 504 | 84.83 |
| 19501 | | 5/82 | Orange | 3,000 | 274,150 | 3,127,000 | 72,900 | 249,783 | 57,902 | 3,784,735 | N/A | 44,291 | 107 | 85.45 |
| 17101 | | 12/82 | San Bernardino | 5,175 | 660,759 | 9,018,560 | 134,490 | 671,634 | 159,359 | 10,649,977 | 60.0 | 122,460 | 1,360 | 86.97 |
| 26102 | | 7/83 | Sacramento | 470,350 | 396,339 | 4,678,000 | 157,100 | 340,415 | 92,633 | 6,134,837 | 29.65 | 52,097 | 480 | 108.73 |
| | TOTAL | | | $1,526,350 | $1,738,403 | $55,785,724 | $995,792 | $3,402,921 | $1,268,220 | $66,717,410 | | 716,430 | 7,839 | |
| | | | | (2.3%) | (5.6%) | (83.6%) | (1.5%) | (5.1%) | (1.9%) | (100.0%) | | | | |
| | Average Cost per Sq. Ft. | | | $2.13 per sq. ft. | $5.22 per sq. ft. | $77.87 per sq. ft. | $1.39 per sq. ft. | $4.75 per sq. ft. | $1.77 | $93.12 per sq. ft. | | | | $93.12 per sq. ft. |

a/Source: Department of General Services, Office of Local Assistance. State Allocation Board Meeting, December 18, 1985. Status of State School Building Aid Applications, Lease-Purchase Law of 1976, Growth, Applications Fully Apportioned (109), Projects Essentially Complete, pages 13.18 to 13.20.

P:265



BEST COPY AVAILABLE